

ViFi: Virtual Fingerprinting WiFi-based Indoor Positioning via Multi-Wall Multi-Floor Propagation Model

Giuseppe Caso, *Member, IEEE*, Luca De Nardis, *Member, IEEE*, Filip Lemic, *Member, IEEE*,
Vlado Handziski, *Member, IEEE*, Adam Wolisz, *Senior Member, IEEE*,
and Maria-Gabriella Di Benedetto, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Widespread adoption of indoor positioning systems based on WiFi fingerprinting is at present hindered by the large efforts required for measurements collection during the offline phase. Two approaches were recently proposed to address such issue: crowdsourcing and RSS radiomap prediction based on either interpolation or propagation channel model fitting from a small set of measurements. RSS prediction promises better positioning accuracy when compared to crowdsourcing but no systematic analysis of the impact of system parameters on positioning accuracy is available. This paper fills this gap by introducing ViFi, an indoor positioning system that relies on RSS prediction based on Multi-Wall Multi-Floor (MWMF) propagation model to generate a discrete RSS radiomap (*virtual fingerprints*). The ViFi system is subject to an extensive experimental analysis in order to address the role of all relevant system parameters. Experimental results obtained in two different testbeds show that the introduction of virtual fingerprints allows reduction by a factor of 10 of the number of measurements, without significant loss in positioning accuracy. The use of two testbeds also allows to derive general guidelines for the design and the implementation of a virtual fingerprinting system.

Index Terms—Indoor Positioning, WiFi Fingerprinting, Indoor Propagation Modeling, Multi-Wall Multi-Floor Model, Crowdsourcing.

1 Introduction

RECEIVED Signal Strength (RSS) fingerprinting is one of the most popular approaches for the implementation of WiFi-based Indoor Positioning Systems (IPSs) [1], [2]. Fingerprinting traditionally operates in two phases. During the so-called offline phase, RSS values from WiFi Access Points (APs) detected in the environment (fingerprints) are collected at selected positions, referred to as Reference Points (RPs), in order to create a discrete RSS *radiomap* of the area of interest. Within the subsequent online phase, the location of target devices is estimated as a function of the positions of the RPs that best match the RSS values measured by the devices. Accuracy and complexity of fingerprinting algorithms mainly depend on two issues: 1) proper definition of similarity metrics and estimation algorithms for selecting the best matching RPs to be used during the online phase, and 2) careful planning of the offline phase, particularly in terms of RP cardinality and positions and of number of measurements collected at each RP [3], [4].

Regarding the online estimation algorithms, deterministic and probabilistic k -Nearest Neighbors (k NN) and Weighted k NN (Wk NN) algorithms are by far the most widely proposed and investigated: on one hand, deterministic algo-

rithms are appealing and relatively easy to implement, because they take advantage of easily computable deterministic similarity metrics [5], [6], [7]; on the other hand, probabilistic algorithms may improve the deterministic accuracy at the price of higher computational complexity and measurement efforts, due to the need of reliably estimating the RSS probability distributions in each RP from each WiFi AP [8], [9], [10], [11]. Regarding the offline phase, two approaches are emerging as possible practical solutions for minimizing efforts and time dedicated to measurements:

Crowdsourcing - In this approach system users, voluntarily or otherwise, contribute to the collection of location-dependent RSS samples, in order to create the environment RSS radiomap, thus drastically reducing or even eliminating the fingerprinting offline phase [12], [13]. Crowdsourcing is an appealing solution, and several companies, such as Google with the Indoor Maps¹ project, have already deployed crowdsourcing-based solutions. Crowdsourcing typically leads to a radiomap not spatially homogeneous since the locations where fingerprints are collected are determined by users mobility patterns rather than predefined planning. In addition, fingerprints are collected by users with their own devices, thus introducing an additional element of heterogeneity. Heterogeneity is indeed the main challenge in crowdsourcing and although several approaches have been proposed to deal with it, the design of an effective crowdsourcing system is still an open research issue [14], [15], [16].

RSS Radiomap Prediction - In this approach, RSS values in the area of interest are mostly predicted rather than

- Giuseppe Caso, Luca De Nardis and Maria-Gabriella Di Benedetto are with the Department of Information Engineering, Electronics and Telecommunications, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy.
E-mail: caso@diet.uniroma1.it
- Filip Lemic, Vlado Handziski and Adam Wolisz are with the Department of Telecommunication Systems, Telecommunication Networks Group, Technical University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany.
E-mail: {lemic, handziski, wolisz}@tkn.tu-berlin.de

Manuscript received –; revised –.

1. <http://maps.google.com/help/maps/indoormap/> (2013).

measured [17]. To this aim, two main methodologies have been proposed: 1) interpolation of measurements, with interpolation parameters optimized for each AP [5], [18], [19], [20], [21], and 2) empirical radio propagation modeling, with site-specific propagation parameters derived through fitting procedures between initial measurements and the selected indoor propagation model [3], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26], [27]. When applied to a fingerprinting system, RSS prediction may be used either for the generation of virtual RPs², aiming at extending the collected fingerprinting database, or for the evaluation of continuous RSS spatial distributions, one for each considered AP, used then to infer the position to be estimated. These possibilities will be referred to, in the following, as *discrete virtual fingerprinting* vs. *continuous virtual fingerprinting*, respectively.

The present work focuses on RSS radiomap prediction, proposing and analyzing ViFi, an IPS based on discrete virtual fingerprinting relying on propagation modeling. In order to fulfill the general goal of keeping the system at a reasonable complexity level, two design strategies were adopted: 1) the Multi-Wall Multi-Floor (MWMF) propagation model was selected among several empirical models, given its analytical simplicity [24], [28], [29], [30], [31], and 2) a traditional deterministic Wk NN-based algorithm was adopted during the fingerprinting online phase. Experimental results were obtained in two different testbeds. The first was deployed at the Department of Information Engineering, Electronics and Telecommunications (DIET) of Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy, and the second at the Department of Telecommunication Systems, Telecommunication Networks Group (TKN), of Technical University of Berlin (TUB), Berlin, Germany. Comparison of results obtained in the two testbeds allowed to derive general system implementation guidelines, that proves to be beneficial for both system designers and users [32], [33], [34].

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews related work in the field of RSS prediction, for both interpolation-based and model-based approaches. Section 3 identifies open issues with respect to previous work, and describes the motivation and goals of the present paper, by also introducing the proposed system. Section 4 contains the analytical foundations of the MWMF indoor propagation model, proposed in this work for the generation of virtual RPs. The ViFi model is described in Section 5, where system offline and online phases are discussed in detail. The testbeds used for the experimental analysis are presented and compared in Section 6. Experimental results are analyzed and discussed in Section 7. Finally, system implementation guidelines are summarized in Section 8, and conclusions and possible future research lines are presented in Section 9.

2 Related Work on RSS Prediction

In this section, previous work on RSS prediction and its application to the design of IPSs is briefly reported, presenting proposed solutions and significant experimental results.

2. In the following we will refer for brevity to *real* RPs meaning real fingerprints collected at the corresponding RP locations, and to *virtual* RPs meaning virtual fingerprints generated as a function of the selected RSS prediction method and the corresponding RP locations.

2.1 RSS Prediction by Interpolation

In [5], Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) and Universal Kriging (UK) interpolation approaches were proposed to generate virtual RPs in a discrete virtual fingerprinting scheme. Experimental results showed that the positioning error, averaged on different $(W)k$ NN (with $k = \{1, 3, 4\}$) estimation algorithms, was reduced for both IDW and UK schemes with respect to the case where only real RPs were used, in particular when the amount of real RPs was low. In [18], an interpolation scheme based on radial basis functions was preliminarily calibrated on real RPs and then used to infer target location; results showed that a reduction of the number of initial real RPs can be achieved at the price of a slightly lower positioning accuracy. In [19], an offline phase-free system named TIX was proposed, that assumes knowledge of APs transmitted powers and locations. Moreover, the APs were modified to measure the RSS of the beacons from neighboring APs. Continuous virtual fingerprinting via linear interpolation was then used to estimate the unknown position. Experimental results showed increased average positioning error by about 15% when TIX was used in place of a traditional fingerprinting system. Discrete virtual fingerprinting via linear regression was proposed in [20]; when generating a virtual RP, regression parameters were obtained by assigning the highest weight to the RSS fingerprint of the closest real RP. Experimental results showed that the introduction of virtual RPs improved the achievable positioning accuracy, in particular in the case of low cardinality of real RPs, confirming the findings reported in [5]. Finally in [21], continuous virtual fingerprinting via Support Vector Regression (SVR) was proposed, and experimental results showed similar performance in static positioning and slightly better performance in tracking, with respect to a traditional k NN estimator, at the price of increased complexity.

2.2 RSS Prediction by Indoor Propagation Modeling

In the seminal work on WiFi fingerprinting [3], an empirical propagation model taking into account the effect of obstructing walls on the perceived RSS was proposed. The so-called Wall Attenuation Factor (WAF) was empirically derived by averaging the differences between Line of Sight (LoS) and Non LoS (NLoS) measurements, with a known and variable amount of obstructing walls in the latter case. Once the WAF was evaluated, other propagation model parameters (path loss at a reference distance and path loss exponent, respectively) were computed via linear regression, and RSS values were predicted by using the obtained model. Experimental results showed an increase of the median positioning error in the order of 46% when such model was used in place of real measurements, calling for the definition of a more accurate propagation model. In [22] the placement of WiFi sniffers at known locations was proposed, with the goal of continuously measuring the RSS values from the various APs in the area. A log-distance path loss model was then used in a continuous virtual fingerprinting approach. A similar system was proposed in [23], adopting however a more accurate ray tracing propagation model. It should be noted that while these methods avoid offline measurements, they rely on dedicated infrastructure

and on the modification of off-the-shelf APs capabilities. In [24] the impact of using discrete virtual fingerprinting on the achievable positioning accuracy was comparatively analyzed: two empirical propagation models (log-distance and MWMF) and a semi-deterministic model (Motif) were used in the RSS prediction and virtual fingerprints generation. Positioning accuracy was then tested for deterministic NN and probabilistic Bayesian estimators, showing an increase of about 30% in terms of average positioning error for the log-distance model, and a decrease of about 10% for MWMF and Motif ones, with respect to the NN algorithm adopting real measurements. No analysis on the impact of the amount of both real and virtual RPs was however provided and, in addition, little detail was given on the set of propagation parameters used in the MWMF model.

A ray tracing model enhanced with uniform theory of diffraction was proposed in [25], in the context of device-free localization, in order to model both electric field behaviour and human shadowing effects. Results showed, however, an increased average positioning error by 120% with respect to the measurement-based system. In [26], an offline phase-free system named WILL was proposed, that combines temporal and spatial characteristics of indoor WiFi propagation with data provided by an accelerometer embedded in the device; experimental results showed an 86% room level accuracy in a typical office environment. Recently, the possibility of generating reliable virtual RPs, through empirical fitting of a simple propagation model, was confirmed in [27], where a log-distance model was adopted limiting the optimization to the path loss exponent.

3 Motivation and Goals

The analysis of related work in Section 2 highlights that RSS prediction is a promising approach to achieve a satisfactory trade-off between complexity and accuracy in fingerprinting IPSs; however, several open points need to be addressed before it can be adopted as a viable solution:

- Most of the works on discrete virtual fingerprinting provided limited analysis on the impact of the number and positions of virtual RPs on the achievable positioning accuracy and how their use could affect the estimation phase based on k NN/ Wk NN algorithms. The analysis so far mostly focused on showing the impact of the number of real RPs and, in general, no information regarding the amount of generated virtual RPs was provided [5], [20], [24].
- Works proposing offline-free systems mostly require either additional hardware or modification of off-the-shelf devices, and this may be time consuming and expensive, thus nullifying the benefit of avoiding the measurement phase [19], [22], [23].
- Continuous virtual fingerprinting could lead to slightly better positioning performance with respect to a discrete virtual approach, but the possible high increase in system computational complexity should be taken into account when considering the overall system accuracy/complexity trade-off [21], [22], [23].
- To the authors' best knowledge, the possibility of using crowdsourced measurements for RSS prediction and its impact on accuracy is all but unexplored.

The above observations led to the present work, with the following goals:

Introduce ViFi, a WiFi IPS based on discrete virtual fingerprinting relying on the MWMF propagation model.

Compared to previous work, the discrete nature of ViFi differentiates it from [18] and [21]; differently from [19], [22], [23], no dedicated and/or modified infrastructure is required and, with respect to [26], the use of inertial sensors, such as the accelerometer, is not required. Moreover, the selected MWMF model is a reasonable trade-off between the simpler models proposed in [3], [22], [27] and the more complex ray tracing one of [23], [25]; with respect to [24], a more detailed analysis is carried out for the MWMF model.

Carry out a comprehensive investigation on discrete virtual fingerprinting, covering a wide number of aspects regarding its optimal design and implementation. Differently from [5], [20], the present work proposes a more detailed analysis of parameters such as densities and positions of both real and virtual fingerprints, in conjunction with different strategies for their selection and use, in order to analyze their impact on: a) the achievable reliability in generating virtual fingerprints by MWMF, b) the achievable positioning accuracy. Note that the use of two testbeds for the analysis allows to derive more general insights and results.

Explore the use of crowdsourcing in conjunction with virtual fingerprinting, by introducing a dedicated scenario that can be considered a best case, simplified version, of a real-world crowdsourcing one, since it lacks two additional sources of accuracy degradation: a) the use of different devices and b) error in the positions of the RPs as determined and reported by the users. The impact of these two sources of error is left for future work.

Provide general guidelines for the implementation and use of ViFi, focusing in particular on: a) the required spatial densities of both real and virtual RPs, b) the strategies to select and place such RPs, and c) the selection of the value of k of the Wk NN estimator that guarantees satisfactory performance without requiring an extensive training phase.

4 Multi-Wall Multi-Floor Propagation Models

In the context of indoor propagation modeling, empirical narrow-band models are widely used; they are characterized by simple analytical formulas embedded with site-specific propagation parameters, the latter obtained through a procedure of model fitting based on a set of preliminary measurements. In particular, the family of Multi-Wall Multi-Floor models emerged as practical solution to the indoor modeling issue, given its analytical simplicity [28], [29]. In evaluating the path loss for an indoor Tx-Rx path, MWMF models take into account several families of objects that, when obstructing the Tx-Rx direct path, are assumed to impact the signal propagation. In its more general form, the MWMF estimated path loss of a Tx-Rx link is:

$$PL_{MWMF} = PL_{LOS} + A_{MWMF} \quad [\text{dB}], \quad (1)$$

where PL_{LOS} models signal attenuation with Tx-Rx distance d and path loss exponent γ , while A_{MWMF} models signal

attenuation due to obstructing obstacles. The PL_{OS} term is defined as a typical One Slope model, as follows:

$$PL_{OS}(d, \gamma) = l_0 + 10\gamma \log(d) \quad [\text{dB}], \quad (2)$$

with l_0 modeling the $d = 1$ m reference path loss (for free space conditions, $\gamma = 2$ and $l_0 \approx 40.22$ dB @ 2.45 GHz). The A_{MWMF} term definition characterizes the MWMF model. Considering the most general case in which Tx and Rx are located on different floors of a multi-floor building (referred to in the following as 3D propagation case, in contrast with the 2D propagation case, where Tx and Rx are on the same floor), A_{MWMF} can be formulated as follows:

$$A_{MWMF} = l_c + \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text{obj}}} \sum_{i=1}^{I_n} N_{n,i} l_{n,i} + N_f^{\left[\frac{N_f+2}{N_f+1} - b\right]} l_f \quad [\text{dB}], \quad (3)$$

with parameters, related to both signal propagation and environment topology, described in TABLE 1.

TABLE 1: A_{MWMF} parameters description.

Parameter	Description
l_c	Constant Loss
N_{obj}	Number of different families of 2D objects
I_n	Number of types of 2D objects considered for family n
$N_{n,i}$	Number of 2D obstructing objects of family n and type i
N_f	Number of obstructing floors
$l_{n,i}$	Loss due to 2D objects of family n and type i
l_f	Loss due to obstructing floors
b	Empirical 3D propagation parameter

Given an initial set of M real measurements in the area of interest $\mathcal{A}$ and, for each m -th measurement ($m = 1, 2, \dots, M$), the set of topological parameters $\{\mathcal{T}_m\}$, including the specific set and positions of obstructing objects in the m -th Tx-Rx direct path, a least square fitting procedure allows to obtain the set of propagation parameters $\{\mathcal{S}\}$, that minimize the difference between RSS measurements and predictions, as follows:

$$\{\mathcal{S}\}_{\text{opt}} = \underset{\{\mathcal{S}\}}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M |\text{RSS}_m - \hat{\text{RSS}}_m|^2 \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where for the m -th available measurement, RSS_m and $\hat{\text{RSS}}_m$ are the actual vs. the predicted RSS values at Rx, when considering Tx at distance d_m , that isotropically radiates a power EIRP. The $\hat{\text{RSS}}_m$ is computed through the MWMF model as follows:

$$\hat{\text{RSS}}_m = \text{EIRP} - PL_{MWMF}(d_m, \{\mathcal{T}_m\}, \{\mathcal{S}\}). \quad (5)$$

The propagation parameters included in $\{\mathcal{S}\}$ may differ from one MWMF model to the other, and can include parameters characterizing both PL_{OS} and A_{MWMF} [28], [29]. The set adopted in this work is defined in Section 7.4.

5 ViFi System Model

The ViFi system is described in this section. Sections 5.1 and 5.2 introduce the offline and online phases of ViFi, highlighting the differences from a traditional WiFi fingerprinting IPS. Possible implementation options for both phases are then reviewed in Sections 5.3 and 5.4.

5.1 Offline Phase

ViFi uses the MWMF model for the generation of virtual RP fingerprints. Assuming to know the position of L WiFi APs in the area of interest, a set of N^r (possibly crowdsourced) real RPs is first collected, so that a $L \times 1$ RSS fingerprint s_{n_1} is associated to the location of the generic n_1 -th RP. s_{n_1} components, denoted s_{l,n_1} , contain the RSS of the transmission link between the l -th AP and the n_1 -th RP, and are usually obtained by averaging $q > 1$ measurements taken in the same RP, in order to counteract channel variability. The selection of the value of q is a compromise between system accuracy and time and effort devoted to measurements. Moreover, in general, only a subset of the L APs are detected in the location of the generic RP; for this reason, s_{n_1} components corresponding to APs that are not detected are usually set to a predefined value, much smaller than measured values.

The MWMF model is then calibrated on the set of real fingerprints and used for the generation of N^v virtual fingerprints, each one associated to the position of a virtual RP. The component $\hat{s}_{l,n_2}$ of the generic $L \times 1$ fingerprint $\hat{s}_{n_2}$ contains the RSS predicted for the transmission link from the l -th AP to the n_2 -th virtual RP.

5.2 Online Phase

ViFi combines real RPs and MWMF-based virtual RPs within a deterministic WkNN estimation algorithm in order to infer target location.

Denoting with $N = N^r + N^v$ the total number of RPs in $\mathcal{A}$, with s_n ($n = 1, 2, \dots, N$) the RSS fingerprint of the generic n -th RP, and with s_i the RSS fingerprint collected during the i -th positioning request by a target device, position estimation relies on the computation of a similarity metric $\text{sim}_{n,i} = \text{sim}(s_n, s_i)$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots, N$), defined as a part of the position estimation algorithm. By selecting the k RPs that, according to the total set of $\text{sim}_{n,i}$ values, are most similar to s_i , the WkNN estimated position $\hat{p}_i$ is:

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^k (\text{sim}_{n,i}) p_n}{\sum_{n=1}^k \text{sim}_{n,i}}, \quad (6)$$

where $p_n = (x_n, y_n, z_n)$ is the position of the n -th RP in a 3D coordinate system, and $\hat{p}_i = (\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_i)$ is the estimated position for the i -th online reading in the same system.

In the context of deterministic algorithms, $\text{sim}_{n,i}$ is a deterministic metric computable in the RSS space between vectors s_n and s_i . A very popular choice is the use of the inverse Minkowski distance of order o :

$$\text{sim}_{n,i} = [\mathcal{D}_{n,i}^o]^{-1} = \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^L |s_{l,i} - s_{l,n}|^o \right)^{\frac{1}{o}} \right]^{-1}, \quad o \geq 1. \quad (7)$$

Orders that are typically used are $o = 1$, corresponding to the inverse Manhattan distance, and $o = 2$, corresponding to the inverse Euclidean distance, that is the metric used in ViFi. Similarity metrics based on modified versions of the inner product between RSS vectors are quite popular as well. Readers interested in the analysis of the impact of different similarity metrics on positioning accuracy may refer to [35], [36].

5.3 Offline Phase Implementation Options

The implementation of the ViFi offline phase must address two main issues: a) how to use the real RPs, and b) how to determine the number and positions of virtual RPs. These issues are discussed in Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, respectively.

5.3.1 Handling real RPs: Selection Strategies

Both cardinality and positions of real RPs affect the generation of virtual RPs and the resulting ViFi positioning accuracy. Under the assumption of having a number N^r of real RPs regularly spaced over a grid in $\mathcal{A}$, the density of such RPs per square meter can be defined as follows:

$$d^r = \frac{N^r}{|\mathcal{A}|}. \quad (8)$$

d^r is expected to affect the reliability of the MWMF model in the creation of virtual RPs, since it defines the cardinality of the measurements of Equation (4). As previously discussed in [30] and [31], the measurements in each RP refer to a set of $L > 1$ APs, leading to two different Selection Strategies:

Strategy I: Environment Fitting - In this Strategy, the set of measurements from the L APs collected in the environment $\mathcal{A}$ are used to perform a global optimization procedure, leading to a common set of propagation parameters to be used for all APs in $\mathcal{A}$. Strategy I assumes that a unique set of parameters can globally characterize the environment.

Strategy II: Specific AP Fitting - This Strategy discriminates measurements at each RP, as a function of the l -th AP they refer to: a different fitting procedure is carried out for each AP, leading to a different set of propagation parameters for each AP.

5.3.2 Handling virtual RPs: Placement Schemes

Cardinality and positions of virtual RPs are also expected to affect positioning accuracy. In analogy to Equation (8), denoting with N^v the number of virtual RPs to be generated, the density of these RPs can be defined as follows:

$$d^v = \frac{N^v}{|\mathcal{A}|}. \quad (9)$$

Moreover, positions of virtual RPs in the area can be freely defined. Two different Placement Schemes that define how virtual RPs are placed in $\mathcal{A}$ are considered in this work:

Scheme 1: Random - In this Scheme, virtual RPs are randomly placed in the area, without any specific constraint on their relative positions.

Scheme 2: Grid - In this Scheme, virtual RPs are placed on a grid in the area, with grid step determined by d^v .

5.4 Online Phase Implementation Options

As described in Section 5.2, during the online estimation phase, ViFi uses a traditional $WkNN$ algorithm combined with the inverse Euclidean distance as a similarity metric. The value of k is thus the main parameter affecting the positioning accuracy of the algorithm. Section 5.4.1 discusses previous solutions proposed in the literature for selecting k and proposes a novel selection scheme.

5.4.1 Selection of the k value

Several previous investigations have addressed the impact of the methodology of selecting the set of k RPs and the value of k itself on positioning performance of deterministic $WkNN$ algorithms, when only real RPs are used in the estimation phase. Such works highlighted that in most cases a single value of k that minimizes the error at all possible target locations in the area of interest does not exist, and that a dynamic selection of k should be pursued. Dynamic k selection strategies increase, however, the complexity of the online phase, and provide no guarantee of achieving the optimal performance in all cases [36], [37].

The solution proposed in most cases is, therefore, to adopt the value of k leading to the minimization of the average positioning error, denoted as k_{opt} . Several experimental studies carried out in different environments found that k_{opt} lies in the range between 2 and 10 [2], [3], [4], [5], [35], [37]. The empirical result is reasonable by considering that, on one hand, if $k = 1$ is selected, each positioning request is solved by assigning to the target device the position of the best matching RP, and this could lead to high positioning errors for some target positions. On the other hand, as k increases, more and more RPs are included in Equation (6), eventually including some with low similarity, and thus decreasing the positioning accuracy.

Determining the value of k_{opt} for a specific IPS is, however, not trivial, and no univocal and general way to find k_{opt} as a function of system parameters was proposed even for systems only using real RPs. Existing solutions require the introduction of a dedicated, site-specific, testing phase during which, preliminarily to the use of the system by real users, the system developer collects a set of Test Points and uses them to test the system accuracy by varying the value of k , at the price of further measurement efforts for collecting the RSS values at the locations of the Test Points. In the following, a model for determining a reliable approximation of k_{opt} without dedicated testing is proposed, moving from the observation that some form of dependency of the value of k_{opt} on the density of RPs can be safely assumed. In the proposed system, both real and virtual fingerprints are considered, and such dependency can be expressed as:

$$k_{opt} = f(d^r, d^v). \quad (10)$$

It should be noted, however, that, due to the adoption of the empirical MWMF model in their generation, virtual fingerprints have some specific properties when compared to real fingerprints. In particular, virtual fingerprints show a high spatial correlation, with variations of RSS values between two fingerprints directly related to the physical distance between the corresponding RPs, without the abrupt

changes introduced in real fingerprints by measurement errors and channel fading. As a result, it can be expected that k_{opt} increases with the density of fingerprints, in particular when the density of virtual RPs is relatively large compared to the density of real RPs.

Moving from this observation, we propose a linear law for $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, leading to an approximate k_{opt} value, k_{est} , as follows:

$$k_{\text{opt}} \approx k_{\text{est}} = \lceil \alpha(d^r + d^v)|\mathcal{A}| \rceil, \quad \alpha \ll 1. \quad (11)$$

In general, the value of α that satisfies the condition in Equation (11) will be environment-specific, and will again require a testing phase to determine its exact value. It should be noted however that if the increase of the positioning error with k around k_{opt} is gradual rather than abrupt, then any value of k around k_{opt} lead to comparable positioning error. Any value of α leading to a value of k_{est} close enough to k_{opt} would be acceptable, especially if the α value fits most environments without the need of a testing phase. This possibility will be explored later in this work, first by assessing the validity of Equation (11), and then by determining the values of α that lead to the best approximation of k_{est} in SPinV and TWIST testbeds. The procedure adopted for determining the value of α is described in Section 7.3, while results of the application of such procedure in the two testbeds are reported in Section 7.6.4.

6 Testbeds for the Experimental Analysis

This section describes the testbeds, implemented at Sapienza University of Rome (SPinV) and Technical University of Berlin (TWIST). Main characteristics are presented, pointing out testbeds similarities and dissimilarities.

6.1 SPinV

Supporting People indoor: a navigation Venture (SPinV) is the indoor positioning testbed implemented at the DIET Department of Sapienza University of Rome. SPinV is deployed in an office environment and covers two floors with an area of roughly $42 \times 12 \text{ m}^2$ each. $L_1 = 6$ WiFi APs working @ 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz, and $L_2 = 7$ WiFi APs working @ 2.4 GHz, with a beacon transmission period of $T_b = 100 \text{ ms}$ and a transmission power EIRP = 20 dBm, are placed at known positions at the 1-st and 2-nd floor, respectively. In order to analyze the performance of ViFi, the entire SPinV 2-nd floor has been adopted as evaluation environment $\mathcal{A}$, and the APs on this floor have been considered in the fingerprinting measurement campaign, so that $L = L_2$. During the fingerprinting offline phase, $N^{r,\text{tot}} = 72$ RPs have been identified on a regular grid and measured within $\mathcal{A}$; then, the online phase positioning accuracy has been then tested by similarly collecting a further set of $N^t = 31$ uniformly distributed Test Points (TPs).

Within the SPinV testbed, both RPs and TPs have been collected in two different measurement campaigns with the goal of testing the proposed virtual fingerprinting approach in two different applicative scenarios:

Controlled Scenario - In order to limit as much as possible environmental and propagation interference factors, all measurements of this scenario have been carried out during weekend afternoons, using a MacBook Pro equipped with

an AirPort Extreme Network Interface Card and placed on a wooden platform, in order to eliminate the possible impact of the human body presence on the measured RSS values. Both RPs and TPs fingerprints have been defined using $q = 50$ scans of the wireless environment, averaging out fluctuations due to channel and measurements variability.

Crowdsourcing-like Scenario - In this scenario, all measurements have been carried out during weekdays, with human surveyors equipped with Android-based Samsung tablets. RPs fingerprints have been defined by averaging $q = 5$ scans of the wireless environment, while TPs fingerprints comprise a unique scan of the environment for each measurement point.

A specific characteristic of the SPinV testbed is the location of APs. On both floors, APs are in fact placed in the counter-top of the corridor running through the floor, as shown in Figure 1. SPinV can be thus considered an example of sub-optimal environment, since its APs topology is expected to guarantee low spatial diversity, with a negative impact on indoor positioning accuracy.

6.2 TWIST

The TKN Wireless Indoor Sensor network Testbed (TWIST) is the indoor positioning testbed implemented at the TKN headquarter at TUB, in the context of the EVARILOS Project [32], [33]. TWIST is deployed in an office environment and covers one floor with an area of roughly $30 \times 15 \text{ m}^2$. Within this environment, $L = 4$ dedicated WiFi APs were placed at known positions and configured to operate @ 2.4 GHz with a beacon transmission period of $T_b = 100 \text{ ms}$ and a transmission power EIRP = 20 dBm. In order to analyze the performance of ViFi, the entire TWIST floor has been adopted as evaluation environment $\mathcal{A}$, and the L APs on this floor have been considered in the fingerprinting measurement campaign. During the fingerprinting offline phase, $N^{r,\text{tot}} = 41$ RPs were identified on a regular grid and measured within $\mathcal{A}$; then, the positioning accuracy was tested by collecting an additional set of $N^t = 80$ uniformly distributed TPs.

In the case of the TWIST testbed, the only considered scenario was the Controlled Scenario defined at the end of Section 6.1, and all measurements were taken under the same settings defined in the same section. Moreover, oppositely to SPinV, APs in TWIST are approximately placed at the four corners of the coverage area, as shown in Figure 2. TWIST can be thus considered as an optimal environment, thanks to an optimized signal coverage leading to a high spatial diversity, that is expected to be beneficial for indoor positioning accuracy.

7 Experimental Results and Discussions

7.1 Analysis of the MWMF Accuracy in Virtual RPs Generation.

Given the environment $\mathcal{A}$ and a total number $N^{r,\text{tot}}$ of RPs measured in $\mathcal{A}$, a framework for the analysis of the reliability of the MWMF model in generating virtual RPs has been defined, following the approach in [30], [31]:

- A tunable parameter ρ has been defined, in order to determine the number of RPs N^r used for the model

fitting reported in Equation (4), out of the total number of RPs $N^{r,\text{tot}}$, so that $N^r = \lceil \rho N^{r,\text{tot}} \rceil$. The modeling accuracy in estimating the propagation parameters and generating virtual RPs has been then evaluated as a function of ρ . Figures 1 and 2 show the measured RPs, together with the APs positions and the sets of RPs, when different values of ρ are used in the model fitting procedure, for SPinV and TWIST testbeds, respectively.




Fig. 1: SPinV - real RPs positions (blue squares) and APs positions (black diamonds). Different coloured areas highlight selected RPs when $\rho = 0.1$ (red), $\rho = 0.2$ (red + green), $\rho = 0.5$ (red + green + purple), $\rho = 1$ (all colors).




Fig. 2: TWIST - real RPs positions (blue squares) and APs positions (black diamonds). Different coloured areas highlight selected RPs when $\rho = 0.1$ (red), $\rho = 0.2$ (red + green), $\rho = 0.5$ (red + green + purple), $\rho = 1$ (all colors).

- Given d^r , obtained from N^r (see Equation (8)), the two Selection Strategies introduced in Section 5.3.1 have been used to carry out the model fitting and evaluate propagation parameters.
- For each Selection Strategy, the estimated propagation parameters have been then used to predict the RSS values at the same locations where the $N^{r,\text{tot}}$ were collected. The accuracy of the model was then evaluated by defining the prediction error (also referred to as estimation error) as follows:

$$\delta_n(\rho) = |s_{l,n} - \hat{s}_{l,n}(\rho)|, \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{s}_{l,n}(\rho)$ is the predicted RSS for the generic (AP_{*l*}, RP_{*n*}) pair, obtained by using a set of $N^r = \lceil \rho N^{r,\text{tot}} \rceil$ RPs in the model fitting procedure, while $s_{l,n}$ is the measured RSS for the same pair, as defined in Section 5.1. Assuming the generic $\delta_n(\rho)$ value as a sample of a random variable $\delta(\rho)$, the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $\delta(\rho)$ and the average error $\bar{\delta}(\rho) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^{r,\text{tot}}} \delta_n(\rho)}{N^{r,\text{tot}}}$ were also evaluated.

Results of the analysis are presented in Section 7.5 and 7.7 for the controlled and crowdsourcing-like scenarios.

7.2 Analysis of the Impact of Virtual RPs on Positioning Accuracy.

Moving from the parameters and the implementation options introduced in Section 5, the performance of ViFi was evaluated as a function of: a) the density d^r and the Selection Strategy of real RPs, b) the density d^v and the Placement Scheme of virtual RPs, and c) the value of k in the Wk NN algorithm. The analysis has been carried out by computing the positioning error $\epsilon_i(d^r, d^v, k)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N^t$) for each TP, as follows:

$$\epsilon_i(d^r, d^v, k) = \sqrt{(x_i - \hat{x}_i)^2 + (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 + (z_i - \hat{z}_i)^2}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_i = (x_i, y_i, z_i)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i = (\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_i)$ are the actual and the estimated positions of the i -th target device, respectively. Note that dependence of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ components from the particular (d^r, d^v, k) combination is omitted in Equation (13) for the sake of simplicity. Similarly to the case of the prediction error $\delta_n(\rho)$, the CDF of positioning error $\epsilon(d^r, d^v, k)$ and the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^t} \epsilon_i(d^r, d^v, k)}{N^t}$ have been evaluated.

Furthermore, in order to express the gain in accuracy achievable by the positioning system when using a density of virtual RPs $d^v > 0$, a dedicated performance indicator, referred to as *virtualization gain* $\mathcal{G}(d^r, d^v, k)$, was defined:

$$\mathcal{G}(d^r, d^v, k) = \frac{\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, 0, k)}{\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k)}, \quad d^v > 0. \quad (14)$$

Results of the analysis are presented in Section 7.6 and 7.7 for the controlled and crowdsourcing-like scenarios.

7.3 An Empirical Approach for Selecting k_{est}

As discussed in Section 5.4.1, the value of k_{opt} that minimizes the average positioning error in a given environment should be derived in a site-specific testing phase. However, if validity of Equation (11) is verified among different environments with a common value of α , then k_{est} can be directly computed, leading to negligible performance accuracy losses, while avoiding further measurement efforts for the testing phase.

The following empirical procedure has been applied in order to determine whether a common value of α might prove valid for both SPinV and TWIST testbeds. For each environment:

- Given a generic (d^r, d^v, k) combination, the value k_{opt} and in turn $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ have been evaluated
- For each $\alpha \in [\alpha_{\min} : \alpha_{\max}]$, $k_{\text{est}}(\alpha)$ has been evaluated following Equation (11), and the corresponding average positioning error, denoted as $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}}(\alpha))$ has been considered.
- Differences between $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}}(\alpha))$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ have been evaluated and denoted with $\beta(d^r, d^v, \alpha)$:

$$\beta(d^r, d^v, \alpha) = \bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}}(\alpha)) - \bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}}) \quad (15)$$

- The value of α that minimizes β has been selected, and the corresponding k_{est} was selected as a reliable estimator of k_{opt} .

Numerical results of the above procedure for both SPinV and TWIST testbeds are reported in Section 7.6.4.

7.4 Model and Experimental Parameters Setting

As mentioned in Section 4, the set of propagation parameters $\{S\}$ to be optimized in the model fitting procedure may differ dependently on the MWMF model and the environment. TABLE 2 reports the environmental characteristics and the set $\{S\}$ of propagation parameters used in the optimization procedure for both SPinV and TWIST testbeds.

TABLE 2: Model parameters setting.

Parameter	SPinV/TWIST
N_{obj}	2 (walls, doors)
I_{walls}	1
I_{doors}	1
N_f	0
$\{S\}$	$\{\gamma, l_c, l_{\text{wall}}, l_{\text{door}}\}$

Next, TABLE 3 presents the values for the parameters used during performance evaluation: in particular the table reports the ρ values (and corresponding d^r and N^r values) used in the analysis defined in Section 7.1, as well as the values of d^v (and correspondingly of N^v) used to analyze the positioning accuracy as defined in Section 7.2, and the values of $\alpha_{\min}$ and $\alpha_{\max}$ used in the procedure for the evaluation of k_{est} as defined in Section 7.3.

TABLE 3: Experimental parameters setting.

Parameter	SPinV	TWIST
$\{\rho\}$	{0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1}	
$\{d^r\}$	{0.02, 0.03, 0.07, 0.14}	{0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.09}
$\{N^r\}$	{8, 15, 36, 72}	{5, 9, 21, 41}
$\{d^v\}$	{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10}	
$\{N^v\}$	{6, 26, 51, 252, 504, 2520, 5040}	{5, 23, 45, 225, 450, 2250, 4500}
$\{\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}\}$	{0.01, 0.25}	

7.5 Controlled Scenario: MWMF Reliability in Virtual Fingerprinting

In this section, the reliability of the MWMF model in generating virtual RPs is experimentally tested, for both SPinV and TWIST testbeds, as a function of the density of real RPs and the Selection Strategies introduced in Section 5.3.1.

Figures 3 and 4 show the CDFs of the prediction error $\delta(\rho)$ for Selection Strategy I (left) and Strategy II (right), ρ values ranging from 0.1 to 1, and considering a reference AP within the SPinV and TWIST testbeds. Results show that, for both strategies and testbeds, slightly different $\delta(\rho)$ errors are obtained as ρ increases from 0.1 to 1. Strategies perform similarly for the reference AP in the SPinV environment, with a slight performance improvement given by Strategy II, while, within the TWIST environment, Strategy I allows a faster convergence to low values of the prediction error $\delta(\rho)$ with respect to Strategy II.

In general, results suggest that, when a relatively large value of ρ (and in turn of N^r and d^r) is used, Strategy II outperforms Strategy I, with propagation parameters for the specific AP obtained by using a large enough amount of data. On the other hand, when a relatively low ρ value is used, Strategy I achieves slightly better performance than Strategy




Fig. 3: SPinV - CDF of prediction error $\delta(\rho)$ for a given AP: Strategy I (left), Strategy II (right).

II, since it combines measurements from different APs and exploits the environment homogeneity. This is confirmed by observing Figure 5, where the average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$, obtained by averaging all the $\delta_n(\rho)$ values for the L APs, is reported as a function of ρ (for the sake of completeness, in addition to the ρ values in TABLE 3, values of $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$ obtained for $\rho = 0.01$ and $\rho = 0.05$ are also reported). Within the SPinV environment Strategy II emerges as the optimal Selection Strategy since the initial amount of real RPs is large enough and optimal RSS prediction occurs when specific propagation parameters are associated to different APs. On the contrary, within the TWIST environment Strategy I provides a more stable RSS prediction for different values of ρ , since the initial amount of real RPs is reduced and, in this case, Strategy I also benefits from the environment homogeneity and the symmetry in the AP placement.






Fig. 4: TWIST - CDF of prediction error $\delta(\rho)$ for a given AP: Strategy I (left), Strategy II (right).

Overall, results highlight that few uniformly distributed measurements are in most cases sufficient for obtaining a reliable estimation of the propagation parameters and generation of virtual RPs, and this is expected to be of paramount importance in decreasing the measurement efforts in the fingerprinting offline phase. However, in using the MWMF model, measurements can be reduced but cannot be totally avoided, because of the empirical nature of the model. In order to highlight this, Figures 6 and 7 report the CDFs


Fig. 5: Average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$.

and the main statistics of the prediction error δ obtained with Strategies I and II, when $\rho = 1$, in comparison with the prediction error obtained by using a baseline lower bound strategy in which the RSS predictions for the objective area $\mathcal{A}$ are obtained by using the MWMF propagation parameters estimated for a totally different area $\mathcal{A}'^3$. The goal of this comparative analysis is to show an example of the prediction accuracy achieved when the site-specific measurement phase is not carried out. Note that here and in the following analysis error statistics are summarized in the form of boxplot diagrams, in which the reported statistics are minimum, maximum and median values, 25-th and 75-th percentiles, and possible outliers.

Fig. 6: SPinV - Strategies comparison in terms of prediction error δ with $\rho = 1$: CDF (left) and Statistics (right).

As expected, results in Figures 6 and 7 show that, for the reference AP, prediction errors significantly increase within both testbeds when no site-specific model fitting is carried out. In conclusion it can be observed that, in order to obtain reliable MWMF-based RSS predictions, measurements can be significantly reduced but not totally avoided. Furthermore, results show that the selection of the optimal Strategy depends on the number of real RPs. Based on this observation and in light of using this methodology for the implementation of ViFi in a different environment, once the measurement campaign concluded, the average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$ can be used as a reliable indicator for the selection of the optimal Strategy in the subsequent generation of virtual RPs.

3. Parameters obtained in the analysis reported in [29] have been used.

Fig. 7: TWIST - Strategies comparison in terms of prediction error δ with $\rho = 1$: CDF (left) and Statistics (right).

7.6 Controlled Scenario: Positioning Accuracy

In this section, experimental results on the positioning accuracy of ViFi are presented for both testbeds in the Controlled Scenario. The impact on the achievable positioning accuracy of using: a) different combinations of real and virtual RPs, and b) different Selection Strategies and Placement Schemes introduced in Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, is discussed. Moreover, results of the application of the empirical procedure presented in Section 7.3 for approximating the value of k_{opt} in the ViFi online phase are reported.

7.6.1 Impact of d^r

Figures 8 and 9 show the impact of using different amounts of real RPs without introducing virtual ones on the average positioning accuracy, for SPinV and TWIST testbeds. The left hand side of both figures reports the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, 0, k)$ as a function of k : results clearly show a significant decrease of the positioning error as d^r increases, but also that the reduction is less and less significant as d^r increases, suggesting the presence of a lower bound for the achievable accuracy, in agreement with [18]. The bound is possibly due to the inherent measurement error in the collection of real RPs. Results also highlight a different lower bound for the error absolute value in the two testbeds, about 3 m for SPinV vs. 2 m for TWIST. This difference can be possibly explained by the different AP placement for the two testbeds: the spatial diversity of the TWIST APs seems to significantly improve the average positioning accuracy, suggesting that optimal AP placement schemes may positively affect the system performance, even with a low-to-medium number of APs, as also previously reported in [38]. Furthermore, for each d^r , the right hand side of figures reports the boxplot of the positioning error $\epsilon(d^r, 0, k_{\text{opt}})$. A decrease of the positioning error as d^r increases is confirmed; moreover, the value of k_{opt} spans in the expected range between 2 and 10.

7.6.2 Impact of d^v

The analysis regarding the impact of introducing virtual RPs on the ViFi positioning accuracy has been carried out assuming the use of Selection Strategy II and Grid Placement Scheme for SPinV, and Selection Strategy I and Grid Placement Scheme for TWIST testbeds. The motivation for




Fig. 8: SPinV - Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, 0, k)$ (left). Statistics of $\epsilon(d^r, 0, k_{opt})$ (right).




Fig. 9: TWIST - Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, 0, k)$ (left). Statistics of $\epsilon(d^r, 0, k_{opt})$ (right).

this choice is provided in Section 7.6.3.

The left hand side of Figures 10 and 11 shows the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d_{min}^r, d^v, k)$ as a function of k , for SPinV and TWIST testbeds. Furthermore, once k_{opt} that minimizes the error is selected, the right hand side of figures reports the boxplot of the positioning error $\epsilon(d_{min}^r, d^v, k_{opt})$.




Fig. 10: SPinV - Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d_{min}^r, d^v, k)$ (left). Statistics of $\epsilon(d_{min}^r, d^v, k_{opt})$ (right).




Fig. 11: TWIST - Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d_{min}^r, d^v, k)$ (left). Statistics of $\epsilon(d_{min}^r, d^v, k_{opt})$ (right).

Results show that, when d_{min}^r is used, the introduction of virtual RPs significantly contributes to the decrease of the positioning error with respect to case of $d^r = 0$. Results are generalized and extended in Figure 12, where the virtualization gain $\mathcal{G}(d^r, d^v, k_{opt})$, as defined in Equation (14), is reported for both testbeds: the introduction of virtual RPs significantly improves the achievable positioning accuracy for low d^r values, that is few available real RPs, showing the best accuracy for high d^v value, that is a large amount of generated virtual RPs, while the advantage of introducing virtual RPs becomes negligible when a large enough amount of initial real RPs is available (high d^r values).

This is also confirmed by Figure 13, reporting the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{opt})$ as a function of d^r and d^v , and also shows the average positioning errors $\bar{\epsilon}(d_{min}^r, 0, k_{opt})$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(d_{max}^r, 0, k_{opt})$ as performance bounds. Despite the presence of some fluctuations, results indicate that the lowest average positioning error is $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d_{max}^v, k_{opt})$ for each d^r .




Fig. 12: Virtualization gain $\mathcal{G}(d^r, d^v, k_{opt})$.




Fig. 13: Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{opt})$.




Fig. 14: Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d_{\max}^v, k)$ for Selection Strategies I and II and Grid Placement Scheme.

value, obtained thus when a high value of virtual RPs were generated. Moreover, Figure 13 also shows that all $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r < d_{\max}^r, d_{\max}^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ nearly achieve the same error (with the only exception of $\bar{\epsilon}(d_{\min}^r, d_{\max}^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ in the SPinV testbed, that is higher of about 60 cm). This further confirms that the ViFi system allows to significantly reduce time and efforts dedicated to the offline measurement phase with negligible effects on positioning accuracy.

7.6.3 Impact of real RPs Selection Strategies and virtual RPs Placement Schemes

This section discusses the impact on the positioning accuracy of applying different real RPs Selection Strategies and virtual RPs Placement Schemes, in order to justify the choice of using Selection Strategy II and Grid Placement Scheme for SPinV, and Selection Strategy I and Grid Placement Scheme for TWIST testbeds, respectively.

Figure 14 reports the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d_{\max}^v, k)$ for both Selection Strategies I and II. Results are in agreement with Figure 5: within the SPinV environment, Strategy II always outperforms Strategy I, with the only exception of $d^r = d_{\min}^r$; on the contrary, within the TWIST environment, the robustness of Strategy I in generating reliable virtual RPs even with low amounts of real RPs turns into a significant stability of this Strategy in terms of achievable positioning accuracy. In conclusion one can observe that: 1) the selection of the optimal Strategy depends on the amount of available real RPs, and 2) a direct relationship exists between the average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$ and the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k)$: the Strategy minimizing the average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$ also minimizes the average positioning error, and should thus be selected.

Figure 15 reports the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d_{\max}^v, k)$ for both Grid and Random Placement Schemes. Selection Strategy II is assumed in the model fitting of the SPinV testbed, while Strategy I is used for TWIST. Results show that no significant positioning improvement when using a particular Placement Scheme has been found, suggesting that a uniform spatial distribution of virtual RPs is a reasonable choice for achieving satisfactory positioning accuracy.

7.6.4 Empirical Derivation of k_{est}

Results presented in Figures 10 and 11 support the relationship between k_{opt} , d^r and d^v , introduced in Section 5.4.1 to define k_{est} . In particular, focusing on the right hand side of figures, where the experimental values of k_{opt} for all values of d^v are reported, it can be observed that the value of k_{opt} appears to be directly proportional to $d^r + d^v$, supporting




Fig. 15: Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d_{\max}^v, k)$ for Selection Strategy II (SPinV), Selection Strategy I (TWIST), Random (R) and Grid (G) Placement Schemes.




Fig. 16: β as a function of α and d^r ($d^v = d_{\max}^v$).

the validity of both Equations (10) and (11). The value of α guaranteeing a reliable estimation of k_{opt} can be then derived, for both environments, through the application of the empirical procedure introduced in Section 7.3. Based on the analysis of the impact of d^v on the positioning error, the procedure has been applied when $d^v = d_{\max}^v$.

Figure 16 presents $\beta(d^r, d_{\max}^v, \alpha)$ as a function of α and d^r as in TABLE 3. Results show that, for each d^r value, β is consistently close to its minimum when a value of α between 0.01 and 0.05 is used, for both SPinV and TWIST environments; this suggests that a value lower or equal to 5% of the total amount of $N^r + N^v$ RPs may be adopted for k in order to achieve a positioning error close to its minimum. The finding is supported by results shown in Figures 17 and 18. Figure 17 shows the experimental k_{opt} values obtained for several d^r and d^v combinations, in comparison with the surface of estimated k_{est} values obtained as $k_{\text{est}} = \lceil 0.05(d^r + d^v) |A| \rceil$. Moreover, comparison between the average positioning errors $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}})$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ is shown in Figure 18. The small difference between k_{opt} and k_{est} values and, more significantly, between the corresponding average positioning errors, corroborate the reliability of the proposed k_{opt} estimator and its applicability, with α set to 0.05, to different environments.

7.7 Crowdsourcing-like Scenario

In this section the performance of ViFi in the Crowdsourcing-like Scenario, within the SPinV testbed, is reported.

Figure 19 reports the average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$ for the SPinV testbed in case of Crowdsourcing-like Scenario. A comparison with Figure 5a, reporting $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$ for the Controlled Scenario, highlights that reduction of measurements and introduction of heterogeneity inherent to crowdsourcing




Fig. 17: Surface of $k_{\text{est}} = \lceil 0.05(d^r + d^v)|\mathcal{A}| \rceil$ and corresponding k_{opt} values for different values of d^r and d^v .




Fig. 18: Comparison of average positioning errors $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}})$.

lead to a degradation in prediction accuracy, particularly relevant for low ρ values and Strategy I. Given the direct relationship between average prediction error and average positioning error, observed in the Controlled Scenario, an overall positioning accuracy decrease can be expected and is indeed confirmed by results in the following figures.




Fig. 19: SPinV (Crowdsourcing-like Scenario) - Average prediction error $\bar{\delta}(\rho)$.

Figure 20 reports in fact the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ and, when compared against Figure 13, confirms that introducing crowdsourced measurements decreases the positioning accuracy, with a significant increase of the error lower bound $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r_{\text{max}}, 0, k_{\text{opt}})$ of about 90 cm. ViFi accommodates its performance on the new lower bound, confirming its capability to reach the same performance obtained with an exhaustive offline measurement phase with a significant reduction of the measurement effort. Results on the evaluation of the virtualization gain $\mathcal{G}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$, reported in Figure 21a, show similar trends with respect

to the Controlled Scenario seen in Figure 12, with higher virtualization gains for low d^r , high d^v values.




Fig. 20: SPinV (Crowdsourcing-like Scenario) - Average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$.

Finally, Figure 21b compares, in analogy with Figure 18, the average positioning errors $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}})$, with k_{est} evaluated with $\alpha = 0.05$: results confirm that the selection of 5% of the total amount of RPs as value of k leads to a reliable approximation of the minimum average positioning error. In light of the above results, it is possible to conclude that ViFi is applicable to both controlled and crowdsourcing scenarios; however, considering the possibility of significantly reducing the number of initial real RPs to be measured, a controlled scenario should be preferred whenever possible.

8 Implementation Guidelines

The consistency in the behavior of the ViFi system across two different environments allows to derive a set of guidelines that may prove valuable in its implementation in a generic environment of area $|\mathcal{A}|$:

- 1) A density of real RPs ranging from 0.01 to 0.02 RPs/m² is sufficient for obtaining reliable MWMF-based RSS prediction and virtual RPs generation in the area of interest. It is convenient to carefully collect repeated measurements for each RP, in order to avoid the possible increase of the positioning error due to unstable measurements.




Fig. 21: SPinV (Crowdsourcing-like Scenario) - Virtualization gain $\mathcal{G}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ (a) and Comparison of average positioning errors $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{opt}})$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(d^r, d^v, k_{\text{est}})$ (b).

- 2) The average prediction error $\bar{\delta}$ is a reliable indicator for choosing the Selection Strategy leading to the minimization of the average positioning error $\bar{\epsilon}$.
- 3) A density of virtual RPs ranging from 5 to 10 RPs/m² is large enough for obtaining a positioning accuracy comparable with the one that could be obtained when a higher amount of real RPs is collected.
- 4) For the $WkNN$ online estimator, a value of k equal to 5% of the total number of real and virtual RPs guarantees an average positioning error close to the minimum achievable value.

9 Conclusion

In this work a virtual fingerprinting indoor positioning system, referred to as ViFi, has been proposed and analyzed. ViFi uses the empirical MWMF indoor propagation model for the generation of virtual RPs and a deterministic Euclidean $WkNN$ algorithm to infer the target location.

Impact of initial density of real RPs, used to 1) fit the model, 2) evaluate the site-specific propagation parameters and then 3) generate the virtual RPs, has been analyzed in terms of accuracy of the generated virtual RPs, and experimental results have shown a high robustness of the model in generating such RPs even in the case of low amount of available real RPs and crowdsourced measurements. Furthermore, impact of density of virtual RPs on achievable positioning accuracy has been analyzed, showing that the introduction of virtual RPs significantly decreases the system positioning error, in particular with respect to traditional real RPs-only systems using a low amount of RPs. Regarding the $WkNN$ estimation algorithm, an empirical procedure allowing the selection of a near-optimal value of k has been proposed and experimentally validated.

Future work goes in the direction of extending the analysis reported in this work. On one hand, regarding ViFi computational complexity, the introduction of schemes for reducing the online phase complexity, such as RP clustering and estimation algorithm optimization is under analysis. On the other hand, optimization of propagation modeling, by taking into account other significant factors affecting the WiFi signal propagation and the perceived RSS values, such as device heterogeneity and orientation, is currently being investigated, given its importance in particular in the crowdsourced scenario of application. Finally, a detailed performance comparison with interpolation procedures in creating virtual RPs can be a further research line.

References

- [1] H. Liu, H. Darabi, P. Banerjee and J. Liu, "Survey of Wireless Indoor Positioning Techniques and Systems," in *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. C Appl. Rev.*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1067–1080, Nov. 2007.
- [2] V. Honkavirta, T. Perälä, S. Ali-Löytty and R. Piché, "Comparative Survey of WLAN Location Fingerprinting Methods," in *Proc. of IEEE WPNC*, pp. 243–251, Mar. 2009.
- [3] P. Bahl and V. N. Padmanabhan, "RADAR: An in-building RF-based User Location and Tracking System," in *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM*, vol. 2, pp. 775–784, Mar. 2000.
- [4] M. Kessel and M. Werner, "SMARTPOS: Accurate and Precise Indoor Positioning on Mobile Phones," in *Proc. of IARIA MOBILITY*, pp. 158–163, Oct. 2011.
- [5] B. Li, J. Salter, A. G. Dempster and C. Rizos, "Indoor Positioning Techniques based on Wireless LAN," in *Proc. of IEEE AusWireless*, pp. 13–16, Mar. 2006.
- [6] B. Shin, J. H. Lee, T. Lee and H. S. Kim, "Enhanced Weighted K-Nearest Neighbor Algorithm for Indoor Wi-Fi Positioning Systems," in *Proc. of IEEE ICCM*, vol. 2, pp. 574–577, Apr. 2012.
- [7] F. Yu, M. Jiang, J. Liang, X. Qin, M. Hu, T. Peng and X. Hu, "5G WiFi Signal-Based Indoor Localization System Using Cluster-Nearest Neighbor Algorithm," in *Hindawi Int. J. Distrib. Sens. Netw.*, vol. 2014, Article ID 247525, 12 pages, Dec. 2014.
- [8] T. Roos, P. Myllymäki, H. Tirri, P. Misikangas and J. Sievänen, "A Probabilistic Approach to WLAN User Location Estimation," in *Springer Int. J. Wireless Inf. Networks*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 155–164, July 2002.
- [9] M. A. Youssef, A. Agrawala and A. U. Shankar, "WLAN Location Determination via Clustering and Probability Distributions," in *Proc. of IEEE PerCom*, pp. 143–150, Mar. 2003.
- [10] M. A. Youssef and A. Agrawala, "Handling Samples Correlation in the Horus System," in *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM*, vol. 2, pp. 1023–1031, Mar. 2004.
- [11] N. Le Dortz, F. Gain and P. Zetterberg, "WiFi Fingerprint Indoor Positioning System using Probability Distribution Comparison," in *Proc. IEEE of ICASSP*, pp. 2301–2304, Mar. 2012.
- [12] P. Bolliger, "Redpin - adaptive, zero-configuration indoor localization through user collaboration," in *Proc. of ACM MELT*, pp. 55–60, Sept. 2008.
- [13] A. Rai, K. K. Chintalapudi, V. N. Padmanabhan and R. Sen, "Zee: zero-effort crowdsourcing for indoor localization," in *Proc. of ACM MobiCom*, pp. 293–304, Aug. 2012.
- [14] G. Chatzimilioudis, A. Constantinidis, C. Laoudias and D. Zeinalipour-Yazti, "Crowdsourcing with Smartphones," in *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 36–44, Sept.-Oct. 2012.
- [15] S. Yang, P. Dessai, M. Verma and M. Gerla, "FreeLoc: Calibration-free crowdsourced indoor localization," in *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 2481–2489, Apr. 2013.
- [16] C. Laoudias, D. Zeinalipour-Yazti and C. G. Panayiotou, "Crowdsourced indoor localization for diverse devices through radiomap fusion," in *Proc. of IEEE/GRSS IPIN*, pp. 1–7, Oct. 2013.
- [17] K. Chintalapudi, A. P. Iyer, V. N. Padmanabhan, "Indoor localization without the pain," in *Proc. of ACM MobiCom*, pp. 173–184, Sept. 2010.
- [18] J. Krumm, and J. Platt, "Minimizing Calibration Effort for an Indoor 802.11 Device Location Measurement System," in *Microsoft Research Tech. Rep.*, MSR-TR-2003-82, Nov. 2003.
- [19] Y. Gwon and R. Jain, "Error characteristics and calibration-free techniques for wireless LAN-based location estimation," in *Proc. of ACM Mobivac*, pp. 2–9, Oct. 2004.
- [20] A. K. M. M. Hossain, H. N. Van, Y. Jin, W. S. Soh, "Indoor Localization Using Multiple Wireless Technologies," in *Proc. of IEEE MASS*, pp. 1–8, Oct. 2007.
- [21] N. Hernández, M. Ocaña, J. M. Alonso and E. Kim, "WiFi-based Indoor Localization Using a Continuous Space Estimator From Topological Information," in *Proc. of IEEE/GRSS IPIN*, pp. 148899–148899-4, Oct. 2015.
- [22] H. Lim, L. C. Kung, J. C. Hou and H. Luo, "Zero-Configuration, Robust Indoor Localization: Theory and Experimentation," in *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 1–12, Apr. 2006.
- [23] Y. Ji, S. Biaz, S. Pandey and P. Agrawal, "ARIADNE: a dynamic indoor signal map construction and localization system," in *Proc. of ACM MobiSys*, pp. 151–164, June 2006.
- [24] Widyawan, M. Klepal, D. Pesch, "Influence of Predicted and Measured Fingerprint on the Accuracy of RSSI-based Indoor Location Systems," in *Proc. of IEEE WPNC*, pp. 145–151, Mar. 2007.
- [25] A. Eleryan, M. Elsabbagh, and M. Youssef, "Synthetic generation of radio maps for device-free passive localization," in *Proc. of IEEE GLOBECOM*, pp. 1–5, Dec. 2011.
- [26] C. Wu, Z. Yang, Y. Liu and W. Xi, "WILL: Wireless Indoor Localization without Site Survey," in *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 839–848, Apr. 2013.
- [27] T. Pulkkinen, J. Verwijnen and P. Nurmi, "WiFi positioning with propagation-based calibration," in *Proc. of ACM IPSN*, pp. 366–367, Apr. 2015.
- [28] E. Damosso, L. M. Correia et al., "COST Action 231: Digital Mobile Radio Towards Future Generation Systems: Final Report," European Commission, 1999.
- [29] A. Borrelli, C. Monti, M. Vari and F. Mazzenga, "Channel models for IEEE 802.11b indoor system design," in *Proc. of IEEE ICC*, pp. 3701–3705, June 2004.
- [30] G. Caso and L. De Nardis, "On the Applicability of Multi-wall Multi-floor Propagation Models to WiFi Fingerprinting Indoor

Positioning," in *Proc. of EAI FABULOUS*, LNICST vol. 159, pp. 166–172, Sept. 2015.

- [31] G. Caso and L. De Nardis, "Virtual and Oriented WiFi Fingerprinting Indoor Positioning based on Multi-Wall Multi-Floor Propagation Models," in *Springer Mob. Netw. Appl. (MONET)*, SM-168, 2016.
- [32] F. Lemic, J. Büsch, M. Chwalisz, V. Handziski and A. Wolisz, "Infrastructure for Benchmarking RF-based Indoor Localization under Controlled Interference," in *Proc. of IEEE UPINLBS*, pp. 26–35, Nov. 2014.
- [33] T. Van Haute, E. De Poorter, F. Lemic, V. Handziski, N. Wirstöm, T. Voigt, A. Wolisz and I. Moerman, "Platform for benchmarking of RF-based indoor localization solutions," in *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 126–133, Sept. 2015.
- [34] F. Lemic, V. Handziski, G. Caso, P. Crombez, L. De Nardis, A. Wolisz, T. Van Heute and E. De Poorter, "Toward Extrapolation of WiFi Fingerprinting Performance Across Environments," in *Proc. of AMC HotMobile*, pp. 69–74, Feb. 2016.
- [35] J. Torres-Sospedra, R. Montoliu, S. Trilles, O. Belmonte and J. Huerta, "Comprehensive analysis of distance and similarity measures for Wi-Fi fingerprinting indoor positioning systems," in *Elsevier Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 42, no. 23, pp. 9263–9278, Dec. 2015.
- [36] G. Caso, L. De Nardis and M. G. Di Benedetto, "A Mixed Approach to Similarity Metric Selection in Affinity Propagation-Based WiFi Fingerprinting Indoor Positioning," in *MDPI Sensors*, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 27692–27720, Oct. 2015.
- [37] G. Caso, L. De Nardis and M. G. Di Benedetto, "Frequentist inference for WiFi fingerprinting 3D indoor positioning," in *Proc. of IEEE ICC Workshops*, pp. 809–814, June 2015.
- [38] O. Baala, Y. Zheng and A. Caminada, "The Impact of AP Placement in WLAN-Based Indoor Positioning System," in *Proc. of IEEE ICN*, pp. 12–17, Mar. 2009.



Giuseppe Caso received the M.Sc and Ph.D. degrees from Sapienza University of Rome, Italy, in 2012 and 2016, respectively. He is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the DIET Department of Sapienza University of Rome. From 2012 to 2015, he has held visiting positions at Leibniz University of Hannover, Germany, King's College London, UK, and Technical University of Berlin, Germany. His research interests include indoor positioning technologies and methodologies, with particular focus on WiFi and UWB fingerprinting, indoor channel modeling, UWB communications, cognitive radio and context-aware networking. He is an IEEE Member.



Luca De Nardis (M'98) received the Laurea and Ph.D. degrees from the Sapienza University of Rome, Italy, in 2001 and 2005, respectively. Since 2008, he has been an Assistant Professor with the DIET Department, Sapienza University of Rome. In 2006, he was a Visiting Scholar with the EECS Department, University of California at Berkeley, USA, where he was a Post-Doctoral Fellow until 2007. He has authored or co-authored over 100 publications in international peer-reviewed journals and conferences, including IEEE Journal of

Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Technique, and ACM Mobile Networks and Applications. His research interests focus on UWB radio technology, medium access control, routing and positioning protocols for wireless networks, and on the design of cognitive wireless networks. He is an IEEE Member.



a member of IEEE and ACM.



Technical University of Dresden, Germany. He is an IEEE Member.



of communication networks. He is an IEEE Senior Member.

Filip Lemic is a research assistant and a Ph.D. candidate at the Telecommunication Networks Group of Technical University of Berlin, Germany. He received the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees from the University of Zagreb, Croatia. In 2015 and 2016, he was a visiting research assistant at the Berkeley Wireless Research Center and the Qualcomm SWARMLab at the University of California at Berkeley, USA. His research interests include location and context awareness, Internet of Things, and mmWave communication. He is

Vlado Handziski received the M.Sc. degree from Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia, and Ph.D. degree from Technical University of Berlin, Germany, in 2002 and 2011, respectively. He is a Senior Researcher in the Telecommunication Networks Group at Technical University of Berlin, Germany, where he coordinates the activities in the areas of sensor networks, cyber-physical systems, and the Internet of Things. He is also serving as Interim Professor at the chair for Embedded Systems at

Adam Wolisz received his degrees (Diploma 1972, Ph.D. 1976, Habil. 1983) from Silesian University of Technology, Gliwice, Poland. He joined Technical University of Berlin, Germany in 1993, where he is a Chaired Professor in telecommunication networks and Executive Director of the Institute for Telecommunication Systems. He is also an Adjunct Professor at the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley, USA. His research interests are in architectures and protocols



interests include wireless communication systems, in particular impulse radio communications, and speech. She is an IEEE Fellow.

Maria-Gabriella Di Benedetto obtained her Ph.D. degree in 1987 from Sapienza University of Rome, Italy. In 1991, she joined the Faculty of Engineering of Sapienza University of Rome, where she is a Full Professor of telecommunications. She has held visiting positions at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA, the University of California, Berkeley, USA, and the University of Paris XI, France. In 1994, she received the Mac Kay Professorship award from the University of California, Berkeley. Her research